

ORIGINAL

 Lampert & O'Connor, P.C.

1750 K Street NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20006

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Linda L. Kent
kent@l-olaw.com

Tel 202/887-6230
Fax 202/887-6231

VIA HAND DELIVERY

April 28, 2003

EX PARTE

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals
445 12th Street, SW, Room TW-A325
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

APR 28 2003

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Re: Oral *Ex Parte* Presentations
CC Docket No. 02-33


Dear Ms. Dortch,

On April 25, 2003, Donna Lampert and the undersigned, both of Lampert & O'Connor, P.C., on behalf of AOL Time Warner Inc. met with Carol Matthey, Brent Olson, Darryl Cooper, Michael Carowitz and Bill Kehoe of the Wireline Competition Bureau and with Richard Hovey of the Office of Engineering and Technology and, in a separate meeting, with Linda Kinney, Jim Carr, Jeff Dygert, Chris Killion and Deborah Weiner of the Office of General Counsel regarding the above-referenced proceeding.

In the meeting, we discussed the fact that the proposed Title I reclassification of wireline broadband telecommunications services would be subject to significant legal challenge and uncertainty. We noted that longstanding FCC precedent makes clear that wireline broadband telecommunications services are subject to Title II and that the *Computer Inquiry* requirements are based in Title II as well. We explained that judicial precedent demonstrates that courts have consistently held that the regulatory classification of common carrier services is not a matter of FCC discretion, but rather must satisfy the legal tests set forth in *NARUC I*. We noted that Title I is not a stand-alone basis for authority but must be consistent with other provisions of the Act and that there is insufficient statutory nexus to sustain Title I authority in this case. Based on the case precedent, we observed that judicial deference is unlikely.

We further stated that a shift to Title I would undermine the FCC's enforcement process and noted that the lack of precedent will effectively eliminate enforcement, even assuming that Title I enforcement is upheld in the face of almost certain legal challenge. The resulting uncertainty will further chill information service deployment, innovation and investment.

No. of Copies rec'd 012
List ABCDE

 **Lampert & O'Connor, P.C.**

April 28, 2003

Page 2

Pursuant to Section 1.1206(b)(2) of the Commission's rules, two copies of this letter are being provided to you for inclusion in the public record of the above-captioned proceeding. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Linda L. Kent

Counsel for AOL Time Warner Inc.

cc: Carol Matthey
Brent Olson
Darryl Cooper
Richard Hovey
Michael Carowitz
Bill Kehoe
Linda Kinney
Jim Carr
Jeff Dygert
Chris Killion
Deborah Weiner